



ecology and environment, inc.

160 SPEAR STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105, TEL. 415/777-2811

International Specialists in the Environment

4074

SFUND RECORDS CTR
162748

MEMORANDUM

TO: Paul La Courreye, EPA Region IX

FROM: James M. James, Ecology and Environment, Inc. *JMJ*

DATE: August 31, 1992

SUBJECT: Completed Work, Work Assignment No. 20-18-9J00

CC: Lisa Nelson, Work Assignment Manager
Wenona Garside, EPA Contract Officer
Rob Stern, EPA Project Officer

Attached is the following completed:

PA _____ SI _____ EPI PA _____ PA Review _____ SI Review X

NPL Prioritization _____ SWIFT PA _____ SWIFT SI _____

Other _____

Site Name: Nanabah Vandever Abandoned Uranium/Vandium Mine

EPA ID #: NND986669109 4228

City, County: Prewitt, McKinley

Latitude: 35° 20' 47" Longitude: 107° 57' 00"

State Recommendation: Appears Eligible for the National Priorities List
(for Reviews only)

FOR EPA USE ONLY

CERCLIS Lead: *S* ✓

sw/nv/cwm

recycled paper

SI-1 Complete ✓
pal 12.10.92
NFA/SEA

12/10/92 RW



ecology and environment, inc.

160 SPEAR STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105, TEL. 415/777-2811

International Specialists in the Environment

SITE INSPECTION REVIEW

SUBMITTED TO: Paul La Courreys, EPA Region IX Site Assessment Manager

PREPARED BY: Su-san Wen, Ecology and Environment, Inc. *sw*

DATE: August 31, 1992

SITE: Nanabah Vandever, prepared by Patrick Antonio of the Navajo Superfund Program, dated March 30, 1992

EPA ID#: NND986669109

E & E REVIEW/CONCURRENCE: *Karen Jadd 9/1/92*

RCRA STATUS

☐ Generator ☐ Small Quantity Generator ☐ Transporter

☐ TSD ☒ Not Listed in RCRA Database

HRS CONSIDERATIONS

The Department of Energy (DOE) claim, consisting of approximately 68,370 cubic yards of tailings material is not considered in this evaluation. The DOE claim should be evaluated as a federal facility site.

- o Based on groundwater samples collected from wells in the area, an observed release of contaminants to groundwater has not been documented for the site.
- o Surface water is not used for drinking, recreation, or irrigation.
- o There are no residents within 200 feet of an area of observed contamination.
- o Approximately 577 people live within 4 miles of the site.

COMMENT

The SI author considered the DOE claim in his evaluation of the site while E & E did not consider the claim as part the of site. This accounts for the difference in the recommendations. E & E also evaluated the site based on post-reclamation conditions.

There appears to be a discrepancy between the number of groundwater targets given in the report and the number of targets used in the scoresheets. Only drinking water wells should be considered when evaluating the nearest well factor. A distribution of the number of people within 4 miles of the site should be provided in the report. The reference for the population within 4 miles of the site should be provided.

CONCLUSIONS

☒ Appears to be ineligible for National Priorities List

☐ Potentially eligible for National Priorities List

STATE RECOMMENDATION

☐ No Further Remedial Action Planned under CERCLA

☒ Further Remedial Action Planned under CERCLA

☐ Potentially eligible for National Priorities List

EPA RECOMMENDATION

	<u>Initial</u>	<u>Date</u>
No Further Remedial Action Planned under CERCLA	<i>prl</i>	<i>12.10.92</i>
Higher-Priority for Further Site Assessment	_____	_____
Lower-Priority for Further Site Assessment	_____	_____
Defer to Other Authority (e.g., RCRA, TSCA, NRC)	_____	_____

Notes:

*Post Removal Radiation levels
are protective of human health &
the environment.*